

Control Number: 49737



Item Number: 346

Addendum StartPage: 0





VIA EMAIL

State Office of Administrative Hearings

Kristofer Monson Chief Administrative Law Judge

June 23, 2020

TO: Stephen Journeay, Commission Counsel Commission Advising and Docket Management

William B. Travis State Office Building

1701 N. Congress, 7th Floor

Austin, Texas 78701

RE: SOAH Docket No. 473-19-6862

PUC Docket No. 49737

APPLICATION OF SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY AUTHORIZATION AND RELATED RELIEF FOR THE ACQUISITION OF WIND GENERATION FACILITIES

Dear Mr. Journeay:

On May 26, 2020, the undersigned Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) issued the Proposal for Decision (PFD) in this case. On June 11, 2020, Exceptions to the PFD were filed by Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO), the Public Utility Commission of Texas (Commission) staff, and intervenors, Office of Public Utility Counsel, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative (GSEC), East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., and Texas Industrial Energy Consumers (TIEC). On June 18, 2020, Replies to Exceptions were filed by the same parties, as well as Cities Advocating Reasonable Deregulation (CARD), except GSEC.

Most of the Exceptions and Replies to Exceptions raise arguments that were fully considered by the ALJs and discussed in the PFD and are therefore not addressed again here. In this letter, the ALJs clarify several sections of the PFD and correct a typographical error. The ALJs do not recommend any changes to the findings of fact or conclusions of law.

Exceptions Letter SOAH Docket No. 473-19-6862 PUC Docket No. 49737 June 23, 2020 Page 2

Future Renewable Generation

Referencing the discussion beginning on page 41 of the PFD, SWEPCO clarified in its exceptions how TIEC Ex. 45 shows that its 2020 wind forecast is 24,403 MW (21,359 + 3,044). With this clarification, the ALJs agree this amount is slightly less than the 24,600 MW of wind in SPP's 2029 forecast, as SWEPCO asserts.

Useful Life

On page 56 of the PFD, the ALJs quote the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) study that "the analysis overstates the benefits of extended projects lifetimes." SWEPCO's exceptions argues that this analysis applies only to projected 35- to 40-year lifetimes. The quoted language appears in the study in a section titled "Impacts on Levelized Cost of Energy," which discusses how the levelized cost of energy (LCOE) declines as useful lives increase. After estimating the LCOE for projects with 20-, 25-, 30-, 35- and 40-year useful lives, the study states:

These estimates assume that O&M costs simply scale with inflation regardless of the useful life and that performance degradation as projects age is not present. Consequently, the analysis overstates the benefits of extended project lifetimes on LCOE, though it is still suggestive of a potentially significant positive influence, at least among the near-term extensions from 20 to 25 to 30 years (whereas discounting erodes the benefits of longer-term extensions from 30 to 35 to 40 years).³

The ALJs construe this passage to refer to *all* projected useful lives, not just those with 35-to 40-year lifetimes. Nothing suggests that the "extended project lifetimes" refers only to the 35-to 40-year projects, as SWEPCO suggests.⁴

Congestion and Losses and Gen-tie

In its exceptions, SWEPCO clarified that its high congestion sensitivity accounts for both present and future congestion in its PROMOD model.⁵ The PFD recommended a 5% congestion adjustment to account for the understatement of congestion in the PROMOD model. The ALJs find both approaches reasonable. However, SWEPCO did not present any high congestion cases

¹ SWEPCO Exceptions at 15.

² SWEPCO Exceptions at 28.

³ SWEPCO Ex. 16, Exh. JGD-2D at 7 (emphasis added).

⁴ SWEPCO Exceptions at 28.

⁵ SWEPCO Exceptions at 32.

Exceptions Letter SOAH Docket No. 473-19-6862 PUC Docket No. 49737 June 23, 2020 Page 3

with low gas, and no CO₂ at a P95 capacity factor.⁶ Therefore, the record does not reflect the impact of adopting SWEPCO's high congestion sensitivity in conjunction with the other scenarios recommended by the PFD.

Conditions

GSEC excepts to the following conclusion on page 99 of the PFD on grounds that it shifts the burden of proof:

Furthermore, no evidence was presented that shows the Project would negatively affect SPP's transmission ratepayers in Texas, which is an issue that must be considered in accordance with PURA § 37.056(c)(3).

The ALJs clarify that this passage was not intended to shift any portion of SWEPCO's burden of proof onto the intervenors and should not be interpreted as such. Rather, the ALJs concluded, based on the testimony of SWEPCO witness Ross, that the Project would not negatively affect any electric utilities serving the proximate area.

Typographical Error

TIEC correctly identified a typographical error on pages 82-83 of the PFD. The last sentence on page 82 of the PFD (which continues on to page 83) is corrected as follows:

Any benefit that could have resulted from this guarantee is diminished because the cap includes excludes uncertain and possibly underestimated O&M expenses and does not account for \$480 million in gen-tie construction costs (which the ALJs previously recommended should be included in the Project's economic evaluation).⁷

⁶ SWEPCO Ex. 8 (Torpey Dir.), Exh. JFT-4.

⁷ See Section III of this PFD.

Exceptions Letter SOAH Docket No. 473-19-6862 PUC Docket No. 49737 June 23, 2020 Page 4

With the clarification and revisions described in this letter, the PFD is ready for your consideration.

Sincerely,

STEVEN H. NEINAST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

CHRISTIAAN SIANO

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

All Parties of Record cc: